



## Interview Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/135,504		lgbinadolo	r
Examiner	•	Group Art Unit	
Andrew Fail	е	2611	

(1) Philip Igbinadolor (inventor)	(3) Andrew Faile
(2) Chris Grant	(4)
	(1)
Date of Interview May 23, 2001	
Type: a) 🗌 Telephonic b) 🔠 Video Conference	
c) 🔀 Personal [copy is given to 1) 🔀 applicant 2)	applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)	Monormonia in the property of the property
·	
Claim(s) discussed: Newly presented claim 1	
Identification of prior art discussed:	
Identification of prior art discussed:  None	
•	
•	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)	∰as not reached. h) N/A.
Agreement with respect to the claims f)vas reached. g)	∰as not reached. h) N/A.
Agreement with respect to the claims f) vas reached. g)  Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:	∰as not reached. h) N/A.
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)  Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:  Discussed with applicant the requirements of a substitue special Applicant was advised to seek the services of an attorney, but	Mas not reached. h) N[A].  Iture of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any consistency of the constant of the
Agreement with respect to the claims f) vas reached. g)  Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:  Discussed with applicant the requirements of a substitue spectod Applicant was advised to seek the services of an attorney, but discussed the format of a claim with reference to issued pater	Mas not reached. h) N/A.  Iture of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any  itirication under 1.125. Discussed newly proposed claim 1.  It indicated that was not possible. The SPE and examiner  It claims and offered to draft an exemplary claim for applicant.
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)  Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:  Discussed with applicant the requirements of a substitue special Applicant was advised to seek the services of an attorney, but	Mas not reached. h) N/A.  Iture of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any  itirication under 1.125. Discussed newly proposed claim 1.  It indicated that was not possible. The SPE and examiner  It claims and offered to draft an exemplary claim for applicant.
Agreement with respect to the claims f) vas reached. g)  Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:  Discussed with applicant the requirements of a substitue spectod Applicant was advised to seek the services of an attorney, but discussed the format of a claim with reference to issued pater	Was not reached. h) N/A.  Iture of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any cification under 1.125. Discussed newly proposed claim 1.  It indicated that was not possible. The SPE and examiner of claims and offered to draft an exemplary claim for applicant.  Interd a claim that had numerous features of the invention in a
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:  Discussed with applicant the requirements of a substitue spect Applicant was advised to seek the services of an attorney, but discussed the format of a claim with reference to issued pater Applicant indicated that such claims were "disjointed" and was "flowing" form (similar to newly presented claim 1), therefore,	Was not reached. h) N/A.  Iture of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any cification under 1.125. Discussed newly proposed claim 1.  It indicated that was not possible. The SPE and examiner of claims and offered to draft an exemplary claim for applicant.  Interd a claim that had numerous features of the invention in a
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:  Discussed with applicant the requirements of a substitue spect Applicant was advised to seek the services of an attorney, but discussed the format of a claim with reference to issued pater Applicant indicated that such claims were "disjointed" and was "flowing" form (similar to newly presented claim 1), therefore,	Mas not reached. h) N/A.  Iture of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or an  cification under 1.125. Discussed newly proposed claim 1.  It indicated that was not possible. The SPE and examiner  at claims and offered to draft an exemplary claim for applicant.  Inted a claim that had numerous features of the invention in a  drafting such a claim would not be helpful. The SPE and
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) Substance of Interview including description of the general na other comments:  Discussed with applicant the requirements of a substitue spect Applicant was advised to seek the services of an attorney, but discussed the format of a claim with reference to issued pater Applicant indicated that such claims were "disjointed" and was "flowing" form (similar to newly presented claim 1), therefore,	Mas not reached. h) N/A.  Iture of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any cification under 1.125. Discussed newly proposed claim 1.  It indicated that was not possible. The SPE and examiner not claims and offered to draft an exemplary claim for applicant. Inted a claim that had numerous features of the invention in a drafting such a claim would not be helpful. The SPE and

i)[X] It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

summary thereof must be attached.)